

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6471

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

OTIS RICH, a/k/a O,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (1:08-cr-00411-WDQ-5)

Submitted: July 26, 2012

Decided: August 1, 2012

Before MOTZ, DAVIS, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Otis Rich, Appellant Pro Se. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Michael Clayton Hanlon, George Jarrod Hazel, Assistant United States Attorneys, Mushtaq Zakir Gunja, Antonio J. Reynolds, Jason M. Weinstein, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Otis Rich seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2012) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Rich has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Rich's motion for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED